

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/066,849	02/04/2002	Sung-Kwon Lee	29926/38060	5173	
4743	7590 05/18/200	4	EXAMINER		
MARSHAL	L, GERSTEIN & B	ORUN LLP	RUGGLES, JOHN S		
6300 SEARS	··		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
233 S. WAC	KER DRIVE		ARTONI	110 21(1(0)(1)	
CHICAGO II. 60606			1756		

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Anntination No.	I A - all 4/-)	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/066,849	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Ruggles	1756	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 29 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the property of the pr	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for later than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.	of extension and the corresponding am f the shortened statutory period for repl fice later than three months after the m	nount of the fee. The appropriate y originally set in the final Office a	extension action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifyir	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: amendments to at least claim 1 raise ne	w issues that would require further	consideration.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s): See Continuation Shee	<u>t.</u>	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amend	dment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT plac	e the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	у
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			I
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>1,2 and 4-14</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 4-14.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:		J. Ragglee	
		John Ruggles	
		Examiner Art Unit 1756	

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the previous objections to the claims and the previous formal rejection under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 would be overcome by the proposed amendments, but these amendments have not been entered for at least the reasons given above. Also, while the proposed amended abstract would have overcome previous objections, this proposed abstract is not entirely grammatically correct. The phrase "by using removing an etching stop layer except a portion that surrounds a via hole" found in lines 3-4 of this proposed abstract should be changed to --by removing the etching stop layer except for a portion that surrounds the via hole--, in order to be grammatically correct. Furthermore, while proposed amendments to the specification address many of the previous objections (only some of which were previously exemplified due to the large number of corrections needed, but at least these previously exemplified objections would be overcome by the proposed amendments), these proposed amendments to the specification would either (1) require still further correction (e.g., at line 3 in the amended paragraph on page 2 of the amendment intended to replace the paragraph beginning at line 26 [should have been line 27] on page 3 of the original specification "the nitride layer" should have been corrected to --a nitride layer--, etc.) or (2) necessitate new additional objections (for example, at lines 5-6 in the amended paragraph on page 2 of the amendment intended to replace the paragraph beginning at line 20 on page 1 of the original specification "the portion of conductive layer" should be corrected to --a portion of the conductive layer--, etc.). Applicants should make all appropriate corrections in response to this Office action. The examiner can give additional assistance upon request.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendments have not been entered for at least the reasons given above.

John Ruggles Examiner Art Unit 1756

> MARK F. HUFF SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700